

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/662,560		HATANO, NAOYUKI	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Alan S. Chen		2182	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alan S. Chen. (3) _____.

(2) Anthony Curtis (Reg. No. 46193). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.


Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KIM HUYNH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

2/27/06

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Jerry Heintz (Reg. No. 41828) from the law firm of Gray Cary informed the Office that application files were mistakenly sent to application 10662560 which should have gone to application 10622560. This caused the Office Action submitted 2/15/2006 to be addressed to Gray Cary. Examiner agreed to resend the Office Action to the firm of Mr. Curtis, BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE. Mr. Heintz agreed to send a letter of request to remove the inappropriate/mistakenly mailed files from application 10662560. A courtesy copy of this interview summary will be mailed to Mr. Heintz.